

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

JEAN-BAPTISTE YAMINDI, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CAMERON OSMER, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:22-cv-00961-LK

ORDER ON PARTIES'
STIPULATED MOTION
REGARDING REMOTE TRIAL
TESTIMONY


This matter comes before the Court on the parties' Stipulated Motion Regarding Remote Trial Witness Testimony. Dkt. No. 54. The parties jointly request that two witnesses be permitted to appear at trial via Zoom or another virtual platform: Lisa Mosely, a retired Washington State Patrol sergeant, and Julie Fisher, a Washington State Patrol lieutenant. *Id.* at 1.

Ms. Mosely resides in Colorado and is unable and unwilling to travel to Washington for trial due to circumstances relating to her family. *Id.* at 2. Lieutenant Fisher has a mandatory training scheduled in Massachusetts during trial but has advised the parties that she can be available to testify remotely from the training. *Id.*

1 Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 43(a), “[f]or good cause in compelling
2 circumstances and with appropriate safeguards, the court may permit testimony in open court by
3 contemporaneous transmission from a different location.” On these facts, and pursuant to the
4 parties’ stipulation, the Court finds good cause in a compelling circumstance to permit remote
5 examination of these two witnesses. *See, e.g., Smithson v. Hammond*, No. 3:22-CV-05029-TMC,
6 2024 WL 37097, at *4 (W.D. Wash. Jan. 3, 2024).

7 Accordingly, the parties’ motion is granted, Dkt. No. 54, and Lisa Mosely and Julie Fisher
8 may appear as witnesses in this case and testify in open court by contemporaneous transmission
9 via Zoom or another virtual platform; provided, however, that the parties provide at least 24 hours
10 prior notice to the Court so that the Court can arrange for setup of the required equipment.

11
12 Dated this 22nd day of February, 2024.

13 

14 Lauren King
15 United States District Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24